

From: "Gibson, Christopher" <cgibson@archerlaw.com>
To: Frank Cardiello/R2/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: "Dave Samuel (DSamuel@cmeusa1.com)" <DSamuel@cmeusa1.com>, Joe Criscuolo
<JCriscuolo@oldbridge.com>
Date: 10/21/2011 02:02 PM
Subject: Raritan Bay Slag

Frank:

Have you made any progress in setting up a call between your colleagues at EPA and NL. We're scheduled to be at another CAG meeting on November 1. Many of the questions asked at the last meeting regarding the cap, capping materials, groundwater monitoring, etc., are matters that would be resolved in a detailed SOW and design plan. In other words, I'm not sure what NL or Old Bridge can say in this regard.

My best information is that while people in the CAG may disagree over the location of the cap, there is a consensus some capping remedy on site that could be started next year is the preferred approach. If EPA has a different understanding, please let me know.

But the \$64,000 question is where does EPA stand? NL has committed to attempt to multi-task on many different fronts, and spend substantial sums in the process, to be in the field next year. We need to draft an EE/CA, negotiate a SOW and an AOC, go through public comment, draft an RFP and hire contractors, to name only a fraction of the work that must start very soon. Stated differently, we are already running late and if we do not hit the ground running in the next several weeks, I do not think we can accomplish all of it.

For example Frank, we don't have a contractor in our back pocket ready to go. You know as well as I that this is a big project, and it seems that if we are ALL not committed to moving forward expeditiously (i.e., by November) it is going to be difficult to accomplish what I believe the elected officials and most of the residents of Old Bridge would like to see happen next year.

The first step of this ambitious journey is for NL and Old Bridge to hear that EPA supports this approach. If not, EPA should break that news to Old Bridge and the CAG at the November 1 meeting.

I know it is difficult to set up these calls, and I suspect that what NL and Old Bridge have proposed has engendered a great deal of internal discussion. Nevertheless, we need your guidance and your decision, and we need it now if EPA is interested in the approach we discussed most recently on October 11.

Thanks.

Christopher R. Gibson, Esq.

One Centennial Square
Haddonfield, NJ 08033
Direct Dial: 856-354-3077
Fax: 856-795-0574

cgibson@archerlaw.com

www.archerlaw.com



IRS Circular 230 Disclaimer: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. federal tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) voiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code, or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS E-MAIL TRANSMISSION IS PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL. IF YOU ARE NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT OF THIS EMAIL, DO NOT READ, DISTRIBUTE OR REPRODUCE THIS TRANSMISSION (INCLUDING ANY ATTACHMENTS). IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS E-MAIL IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY THE SENDER BY TELEPHONE OR EMAIL REPLY.